

REMARKS

This Amendment and Reply is intended to be completely responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed April 13, 2010. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 10 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 7-26 will remain pending in the present Application upon entry of this Amendment and Reply.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

On page 3 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that the subject matter of Claim 22 is not disclosed in the specification and therefore, it is new matter. Applicants respectfully disagree. Support for this subject matter is found in paragraph [0023] of the original disclosure, which states that “[a]n automatic turning of the screen 1 in the frame 11 when folding it down from the upper into the lower position of use can be brought about in that the rotational movement in the axis of rotation 3 is transmitted to the axis of rotation 12 in the same or in the opposite direction.” Nevertheless, if an effort to advance the prosecution of the present Application, Applicants have amended Claim 22 for clarity to be more consistent with the language from the original disclosure. As amended, Claim 22 recites “the screen rotates about the second axis of rotation automatically when the frame rotates between the first use position and the second use position.” Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and Claim 23 as it depends there from.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

On pages 3-6 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 16-18, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,056,248 to Ma (“Ma”). On pages 6-9 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-9, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030086240 to Jobs et al. (“Jobs et al.”). On pages 9 and 10 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma in view of Jobs et al., further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,571 to Shida (“Shida et al.”). On pages 10-12 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma in view U.S. Patent No. 5,513,746 to Anderson (“Anderson”). On pages 12-13 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma. These rejections should be withdrawn because Ma, alone or in any proper combination with Jobs et al., Shida et al. and/or Anderson, fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed inventions.

For example, independent Claim 10 (as amended) recites “video screen assembly” comprising, among other elements, a “pivoting arm connected to [a] fitting for rotation about a generally horizontal axis of rotation, the pivoting arm having a frame that encloses [a] video screen, the video screen being rotatable relative to the frame.”

Also, independent Claim 16 (as previously presented) recites a “video screen assembly” comprising, among other elements, a “first joint defining a first axis of rotation, the first axis of rotation configured to be a substantially horizontal axis extending transverse to the vehicle seat . . . a second joint provided at [a] frame [that is coupled to an arm], the second joint defining a second axis of rotation, the second axis of rotation being substantially parallel to the first axis of rotation . . . wherein [a] video screen is rotatable relative to the frame about the second axis of rotation between approximately 150 degrees and approximately 210 degrees so that the display can face the occupant when the arm is in both [a] first use position and [a] second use position.”

In rejecting independent Claim 16, the Examiner alleged that Ma discloses, among other things, a first joint (pin 21 at Fig. 1), an arm (support 2 at Fig. 3), a video screen (display screen 32 at Fig. 3) and a frame (display 3 at Fig. 3). The Examiner then alleged that Ma discloses that the “display screen 32” is rotatable relative to the “display 3” about a second axis of rotation (defined by support pivot 331 at Fig. 1). Applicants respectfully disagree that Ma discloses a video screen that is rotatable relative to a frame. In contrast, the positioning of the “display screen 32” (i.e., the structure the Examiner alleged to be analogous to the video screen) is fixed relative to the “display 3” (i.e., the structure the Examiner alleged to be analogous to the frame). There is no movement between the “display screen 32” and the “display 3” in Ma. Rather, it is the combination of the “display screen 32” and the “display 3” that move relative to the “support 2” about the “support pivot 331.” However, this is not what is being claimed in the present Application. Independent Claims 10 and 16 each recite that the video screen is rotatable relative to the frame.

Applicants further submit that neither Jobs et al., Shida et al., nor Anderson correct this deficiency in Ma as a prior art reference. The Examiner was only relying on Jobs et al. for allegedly disclosing a spring arrangement, Shida et al. for allegedly disclosing a torque transmitting device and Anderson for allegedly disclosing a locking device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 10 and 16 because at least one element of such claims is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Ma, alone or in any proper combination with Jobs et al., Shida et al., and/or Anderson. Claims 7-9 and 11-15, as they depend from independent Claim 10, and Claims 17-26, as they depend from independent Claim 16, are allowable therewith for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in such claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 7-26 is respectfully requested.

* * *

Applicants respectfully submit that each and every pending rejection has been overcome, and that the present Application is in a condition for allowance. In particular, even when the elements of Applicants' claims, as discussed above, are given a broad construction and interpreted to cover equivalents, the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed subject matter. Favorable reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants respectfully put the Patent Office and all others on notice that all arguments, representations, and/or amendments contained herein are only applicable to the present Application and should not be considered when evaluating any other patent or patent application including any patents or patent applications which claim priority to this patent application and/or any patents or patent applications to which priority is claimed by this patent application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/12/2010

By /Adam M. Gustafson/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (414) 297-5652
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Adam M. Gustafson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 54,601